



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD  
393 DARLING STREET  
BALMAIN NSW 2041, AUSTRALIA

**COPY MAILED**

APR 29 2005

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

|                              |   |                         |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| In re Application of         | : |                         |
| Kia Silverbrook et al        | : |                         |
| Application No. 10/815,649   | : | DECISION ON PETITION    |
| Filed: April 2, 2004         | : | UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) |
| Attorney Docket No. HYJ002US | : |                         |

This is a decision on the petition, filed October 13, 2004 which is being treated as a petition, under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the benefit of priority to prior-filed nonprovisional Application No. 10/778,056, filed February 17, 2004.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The amendment submitted concurrently with the instant petition as drafted is unacceptable and, therefore, is not considered a proper reference under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(i) and (a)(5)(iii). In this regard, the amendment is physically part of the instant petition and, as such, does not comply with 37 CFR 1.121, 1.52, or 1.4(c). Note that 37 CFR 1.121 states that amendments are made by filing a paper, in compliance with § 1.52, directing that specified amendments be made. The pertinent section of 37 CFR 1.52 states that the claim (in this case, the claim for priority), must commence on a separate physical sheet. 37 CFR 1.4(c) states that each distinct subject must be contained in a separate paper since different matters may be considered by different branches of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

In view of the above, the amendment to add a priority claim to the first line of the specification, which is physically embedded in the instant petition, is not acceptable. Accordingly, a substitute amendment in compliance with the aforementioned rules, along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), must be submitted.


Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                   Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                              Commissioner for Patents  
                              Post Office Box 1450  
                              Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                 Customer Service Window  
                              Randolph Building  
                              401 Dulany Street  
                              Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax:                  (703) 872-9306  
                              ATTN: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Irvin Dingle at (571) 272-3210.

  
Frances Hicks  
Lead Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy